

## FROM WASHINGTON.

### OUR SPECIAL DISPATCHES.

### Reports from the Reconstruction Committee.

### IMPORTANT FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

### Interview with Mr. Monihon with Secretary Seward.

### SATURDAY'S SESSION OF THE HOUSE.

Speeches of Messrs. Nicholson of Delaware, Perham of Maine, J. L. Thomas of Maryland, Smith of Kentucky, Shellabarger of Ohio, and Hale of New-York.

WASHINGTON, April 22, 1866.  
REPORTS FROM THE RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE.

The statement telegraphed to New-York on Saturday evening that the Reconstruction Committee had prepared various propositions for report is incorrect. There was a meeting of the Committee held yesterday, and more fully attended than usual, and it is understood that various Constitutional amendments and separate measures of legislation were prepared and debated, but that no comprehensive or complete propositions were discussed, and especially nothing definitely concluded upon to report to the House. The Committee will meet again at 10 o'clock to-morrow, when the separate propositions submitted by different members may be embodied in form, preparatory to a subsequent report.

### MR. SHELLABARGER'S SPEECH.

The powerful speech of Judge Shellabarger of Ohio delivered in the House late on Saturday evening, on the subject of National citizenship, and the manner of its enforcement, and the power and right of the National Government to control its resumption after forfeiture, has challenged as profound attention among leading thinking members as any speech yet delivered in Congress. He assumes that citizenship, under our Constitution, is of National, and not State, origin. By a masterly exposition of authorities of a State, national and international character, with the uniform practice of civilized nations, he shows that by participation in the Rebellion the Rebels have lost all right to participate in the Government, and he further claims and shows by precedents that Congress, or the legislative power, can absolutely prohibit their resumption of the right of franchise, except upon such terms as Congress may determine, and that the States have no authority over the matter.

### SUBJUGATED APPOINTED.

The following Examining-Surgeons were yesterday appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions: Dr. James Williamson, Portsmouth, Va.; E. M. Bartlett, Louisiana, Mo.; George W. Wright, Canton, Ill.; George Cowan, Danville, Ky.; and G. E. Waters, Fontenelle, Mich.

### THE TEST OATH.

The Judiciary Committee have agreed to report against any modification of the test oath. They will conclusively answer the objection raised—that its modification is requisite in order to secure proper officials at the South by showing sufficient numbers of competent Union residents to fill every required Federal appointment.

### A COLLECTION.

The compositor, in setting Saturday's dispatches, does too much credit to Copperhead liberality in subscribing for the President's speech, by affixing dollars to the number subscribed for, as they are to cost two cents a piece; and the largest amount ventured by any one of the President's new friends was \$20 for 1,000 copies.

### EXCURSION TO MOUNT VERNON.

Quite a party of Senators and Members made an excursion yesterday to Mount Vernon, reviewing the question of its dedication as a National Soldiers' Home.

### ORDER FROM GEN. GRANT.

Gen. Grant, prior to his departure for Richmond, issued a special order to Gen. Foster for the protection of the Union citizens of Florida from the cruelties and injustice practiced upon them under cover of the State laws.

### A RICHMOND STATEMENT.

Your correspondent at Richmond states that the Lieutenant General, his wife, and wife's father, Col. Baden, Mrs. Grant's brother-in-law, the City Postmaster with several others, to the number of twenty, sat down to dinner given in honor of the party by the proprietors of the Sprucewood House. Senator Yates and ex-Governor Wood, and Col. Sumner of Illinois were the guests of the Col. Loomba. Gov. Smith, of New Hampshire, is also at Richmond.

### GEN. STEEDMAN IN ROUTE.

Gen. Steedman and Fullerton left Norfolk for Newbern to-day.

### SOUTHERN MONTAGNES.

Robert E. Lee is expected here in a few days, and his success here are making due preparations to show him marked attention. Major-elect Monroe, and Alderman-elect Nixon of New Orleans, who have not been permitted to exercise their functions on account of their connection with the Rebellion, are here getting their pardons.

### MASONIC VISITATION.

President Johnson, who is a member of the Masonic Fraternity, has invited the Supreme Council of the Southern Jurisdiction to visit him to-morrow morning.

### PREACHING AT THE CAPITOL.

President Magoun of the Iowa University preached to-day at the Capitol, and the Rev. Dr. Bellows preached at the Unitarian Church.

### THE AFRICAN METHODISTS.

The Conference of the African Methodist Church now in session here, Bishop Payne presiding, decided on Saturday to ordain a white candidate who has for two years preached to a colored congregation. Some of the clergymen in the Conference were opposed to the candidate on account of his color, but others hailed it as a happy omen that a white man should seek ordination from colored men. "Let us," said the Rev. James Reed, "show that we do not despise a man for his color."

### NATIONAL BANKS.

No new National banks were chartered last week; the total number of these institutions now doing business throughout the country is 1,650; the total amount of their notes in circulation is \$208,000,000.

### FINANCIAL.

The disbursements and transfers by the Treasury Department last week amounted to \$10,348,077.

### CASH IN HAND.

Treasurer Spink had in his cash vaults, Saturday noon, legal-tender notes, fractional currency, gold, silver, and other cash, amounting to \$35,918,471.

### INTERNAL REVENUE.

The receipts from Internal Revenue on Saturday last were \$1,418,08, and for the week ending on that day \$3,464,194.28.

### FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

The amount of fractional currency shipped last week was \$25,000.

The disbursements and transfers of the Treasury Department during last week amounted to \$10,348,077.97.

The United States Treasurer at present holds in United States bonds trust as security for the circulation of National Banks \$300,278,550, and as security for deposits in designated Government depositories \$36,014,500.

\$1,544,600 in National Bank notes were issued by the Treasury Department for the week ending the 21st instant. The total amount of circulation issued up to date is \$208,000,000. The following statement exhibits the amount of funds in the vaults of the Treasury at the close of the week ending the 21st instant:

United States Legal Tenders.....	\$2,458,000.00
National Bank Notes.....	192,570.00
Fractional Currency.....	25,000.00
Gold.....	1,406,400.00
Silver.....	282,502.41
Reserve Fund, Temporary Loan.....	16,140,000.00
Reserve Fund, Permanent.....	7,000,000.00
Reserve Fund, Surplus Issue Comp. Int. Notes.....	24,601,300.00
Compound Interest Notes in Redemption Fund.....	4,300,000.00

During last week, Certificates of Indebtedness amounting to \$2,000,000 were issued by the Treasury Department. Fractional Currency to the amount of \$23,750 was redeemed by the Treasury Department last week.

The disbursements of the Treasury last week on account of the War, Navy and Interior Departments was as follows: War, \$9,893,429; Navy, \$1,204,000; Interior, \$171,213.

### FAST DAY TO BE APPOINTED.

It is reported that the President will soon issue a proclamation setting apart the 17th proximo as a day of fasting and prayer, in view of the anticipated visit to this country of the chieftain.

### IOWA LANDS.

The General Land Office has just transmitted to the Governor of Iowa a certificate authorizing that State to locate 9,043 acres of the public domain as indemnity for that quantity of swamp land in Cass County, which had been disposed of by the United States, with bounty land-warrant locations.

### LANDS FOR CALIFORNIA.

The patents which have been issued for Spanish and Mexican ranches in California, the titles to which have nearly been confirmed by the Courts, embrace upward of 3,827,000 acres.

### WASHINGTON, April 22, 1866.

### REPORTS FROM THE RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE.

The statement telegraphed to New-York on Saturday evening that the Reconstruction Committee had prepared various propositions for report is incorrect. There was a meeting of the Committee held yesterday, and more fully attended than usual, and it is understood that various Constitutional amendments and separate measures of legislation were prepared and debated, but that no comprehensive or complete propositions were discussed, and especially nothing definitely concluded upon to report to the House. The Committee will meet again at 10 o'clock to-morrow, when the separate propositions submitted by different members may be embodied in form, preparatory to a subsequent report.

### MR. SHELLABARGER'S SPEECH.

The powerful speech of Judge Shellabarger of Ohio delivered in the House late on Saturday evening, on the subject of National citizenship, and the manner of its enforcement, and the power and right of the National Government to control its resumption after forfeiture, has challenged as profound attention among leading thinking members as any speech yet delivered in Congress. He assumes that citizenship, under our Constitution, is of National, and not State, origin. By a masterly exposition of authorities of a State, national and international character, with the uniform practice of civilized nations, he shows that by participation in the Rebellion the Rebels have lost all right to participate in the Government, and he further claims and shows by precedents that Congress, or the legislative power, can absolutely prohibit their resumption of the right of franchise, except upon such terms as Congress may determine, and that the States have no authority over the matter.

### SUBJUGATED APPOINTED.

The following Examining-Surgeons were yesterday appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions: Dr. James Williamson, Portsmouth, Va.; E. M. Bartlett, Louisiana, Mo.; George W. Wright, Canton, Ill.; George Cowan, Danville, Ky.; and G. E. Waters, Fontenelle, Mich.

### THE TEST OATH.

The Judiciary Committee have agreed to report against any modification of the test oath. They will conclusively answer the objection raised—that its modification is requisite in order to secure proper officials at the South by showing sufficient numbers of competent Union residents to fill every required Federal appointment.

### A COLLECTION.

The compositor, in setting Saturday's dispatches, does too much credit to Copperhead liberality in subscribing for the President's speech, by affixing dollars to the number subscribed for, as they are to cost two cents a piece; and the largest amount ventured by any one of the President's new friends was \$20 for 1,000 copies.

### EXCURSION TO MOUNT VERNON.

Quite a party of Senators and Members made an excursion yesterday to Mount Vernon, reviewing the question of its dedication as a National Soldiers' Home.

### ORDER FROM GEN. GRANT.

Gen. Grant, prior to his departure for Richmond, issued a special order to Gen. Foster for the protection of the Union citizens of Florida from the cruelties and injustice practiced upon them under cover of the State laws.

### A RICHMOND STATEMENT.

Your correspondent at Richmond states that the Lieutenant General, his wife, and wife's father, Col. Baden, Mrs. Grant's brother-in-law, the City Postmaster with several others, to the number of twenty, sat down to dinner given in honor of the party by the proprietors of the Sprucewood House. Senator Yates and ex-Governor Wood, and Col. Sumner of Illinois were the guests of the Col. Loomba. Gov. Smith, of New Hampshire, is also at Richmond.

### GEN. STEEDMAN IN ROUTE.

Gen. Steedman and Fullerton left Norfolk for Newbern to-day.

### SOUTHERN MONTAGNES.

Robert E. Lee is expected here in a few days, and his success here are making due preparations to show him marked attention. Major-elect Monroe, and Alderman-elect Nixon of New Orleans, who have not been permitted to exercise their functions on account of their connection with the Rebellion, are here getting their pardons.

### MASONIC VISITATION.

President Johnson, who is a member of the Masonic Fraternity, has invited the Supreme Council of the Southern Jurisdiction to visit him to-morrow morning.

### PREACHING AT THE CAPITOL.

President Magoun of the Iowa University preached to-day at the Capitol, and the Rev. Dr. Bellows preached at the Unitarian Church.

### THE AFRICAN METHODISTS.

The Conference of the African Methodist Church now in session here, Bishop Payne presiding, decided on Saturday to ordain a white candidate who has for two years preached to a colored congregation. Some of the clergymen in the Conference were opposed to the candidate on account of his color, but others hailed it as a happy omen that a white man should seek ordination from colored men. "Let us," said the Rev. James Reed, "show that we do not despise a man for his color."

### NATIONAL BANKS.

No new National banks were chartered last week; the total number of these institutions now doing business throughout the country is 1,650; the total amount of their notes in circulation is \$208,000,000.

### FINANCIAL.

The disbursements and transfers by the Treasury Department last week amounted to \$10,348,077.

### CASH IN HAND.

Treasurer Spink had in his cash vaults, Saturday noon, legal-tender notes, fractional currency, gold, silver, and other cash, amounting to \$35,918,471.

### INTERNAL REVENUE.

The receipts from Internal Revenue on Saturday last were \$1,418,08, and for the week ending on that day \$3,464,194.28.

### FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

The amount of fractional currency shipped last week was \$25,000.

The disbursements and transfers of the Treasury Department during last week amounted to \$10,348,077.97.

The United States Treasurer at present holds in United States bonds trust as security for the circulation of National Banks \$300,278,550, and as security for deposits in designated Government depositories \$36,014,500.

\$1,544,600 in National Bank notes were issued by the Treasury Department for the week ending the 21st instant. The total amount of circulation issued up to date is \$208,000,000. The following statement exhibits the amount of funds in the vaults of the Treasury at the close of the week ending the 21st instant:

fortunate beings would be left entirely at the mercy of those who will pursue them with a deadly hatred for the sake of a few dollars. It is not so much that the rebels are in Congress, as it is that they have control of the machinery of government here at the South. The rebels are now, perhaps, send up to Congress loyal representatives, that they may the sooner and better obtain the power and authority to crush out the rebellion. It is not so much that the rebels are in Congress, as it is that they have control of the machinery of government here at the South. The rebels are now, perhaps, send up to Congress loyal representatives, that they may the sooner and better obtain the power and authority to crush out the rebellion.

Such are the appeals and such the concurrent testimony of all as to the failure of the policy. "Nevertheless it may be, of placing every State government at the South into the hands of unrepentant rebels. And if some slight consideration of thousands of just such appeals as the above, made by men of character and policy, and whose names are held with reverence for four of our country to still further persecution, brings down upon the American Congress the terrible and almost unbearable imputation and charge of being "radical," then heaven help them to bear that grievous burden before their constituents and the people, who are not yet quite ready to abandon all, for which they have given their treasure, and their father's and children's blood.

Gen. Van Wyck, who so ably represented the Orange and Sullivan District upon the breaking out of the war, has been here the past week. He has struck the keynote of all those who would show the nation's gratitude to her brave defenders. It is well known that the various schemes to deprive the loyal soldiers of their pensions are not only unrepentant. In fact, nobody seems to urge these same claim agents and bounty brokers, and into the hands of these men would the lion's share fall if it attempted. Gen. Van Wyck claims that the nation should not neglect its duty to the soldiers and their families, and that it is to these that the property of the country should and will be given. He desires the \$2 per month pension, which was well for revolutionary times, but with almost universal favor among the Republican members of Congress.

The speeches of the President, and the cause which inspired them, are already fully and ably discussed by the public. It is unfortunate that one so elevated by the choice of the American people should be so disturbed by the criticisms which always have, and doubtless ever will, attend the action of every public man. The President's policy is not, as it is represented, a policy of compromise, but a policy of compromise. It is not a policy of compromise, but a policy of compromise. It is not a policy of compromise, but a policy of compromise.

### XXXIXTH CONGRESS.

### FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.—WASHINGTON, April 21, 1866.  
The Senate is not in session to-day, having adjourned over until Monday.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The proceedings of this day's session were, by order, confined to general debate on the President's annual message. Mr. Nicholson (Del.) was the first speaker. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

dent had made a great and sad, and, he feared, fatal mistake in the indiscriminate manner in which he had placed the red-handed traitors were such friends to the President's policy, because they saw that that policy was to give them back all their rights, as fully, and place them in the position of the Government as fully, as before they went into the Rebellion. The President's policy had done more to make treason respected, and traitors heroes, than the establishment of an independent Confederate Government could have done. It was no wonder that every rebel who could get up, and who did not want to be taken into the hands of the Rebels, but the time would not be long before Rebels would have complete control of the Government in all its departments. It was no wonder that every rebel who could get up, and who did not want to be taken into the hands of the Rebels, but the time would not be long before Rebels would have complete control of the Government in all its departments.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. Smith (Iowa) followed. He took strong grounds against the Constitutional amendment in regard to representation. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise. He contended that the amendment was a violation of the Constitution, and that it was a policy of compromise.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.

Mr. SHELLABARGER made a statement in this connection. He said that within a few days past the Attorney-General of the United States stated to him and another gentleman, not in confidence or privately, that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper, and that the position taken by the Chief Justice was proper.